



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,342	09/13/2004	Shih-Yuan Huang	72836.P113	5341
53720	7590	04/21/2009		
YING CHEN			EXAMINER	
Chen Yoshimura LLP			GOODCHILD, WILLIAM J	
255 S. GRAND AVE.				
# 215			ART UNIT	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012			2445	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			04/21/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ychen@cyiplaw.com
miwa@cyiplaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,342

Applicant(s)

HUANG, SHIH-YUAN

Examiner

WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10, 16, 17, 22-27 and 38-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10, 16-17, 22-27 and 38-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/06/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson et al., (US Publication No. 2003/0033464), (hereinafter Larson), and further in view of Brunner, JR. et al., (US Publication No. 2003/0213868), (hereinafter Brunner).

Regarding claim 16, Larson discloses an advanced intelligent platform management interface (IPMI) system with multi-message and configurable performance, optimally used among message sources [Larson, paragraphs 42-43] the IPMI system comprising: an IPMI message subsystem [Larson, paragraph 43] having a channel center used to receive/send an IPMI message from message sources [Larson, paragraph 42], and having a message execution group [Larson, paragraph 59-60] which initiates a corresponding execution procedure with respect to each IPMI message [Larson, paragraphs 59-60];

an IPMI core subsystem having a plurality of application units at least one which executes the IPMI message according to the execution procedure of the IPMI message subsystem [Larson, paragraph 60];

a central message buffer unit [Larson, paragraphs 59-60];

a real time operating system (RTOS) management module having multiple specific mapping functions for communicating with different types of RTOS, allowing the advanced IPMI system to function with different RTOS [Larson, paragraph 72].

Larson does not specifically disclose a central message buffer unit having a memory block which provides a pointer of a corresponding address in the block for temporary storage of each IPMI message wherein each said subsystem just transmits the pointer therebetween thereby reducing times of reading the IPMI message and raising the performance of the IPMI system.

However, Brunner discloses the user interface may transmit a pointer associated with the selected target from the user input to the target processor, which in turn, retrieves the target data associated with transmitted pointer from the memory [Brunner, paragraph 34].

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Brunner as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Mihm et al., (US Publication No. 2005/0229173), (hereinafter Mihm).

Regarding claim 17, Larson-Brunner does not specifically disclose a hardware management module having a plurality of driver units for communicating with different baseboard management controllers (BMC), allowing the advanced IPMI system to function in different hardware environments.

However, Mihm discloses the IPMI specification defines multiple interfaces for communication with the BMC and for getting information that the BMC provides and for communication with multiple BMC's [Mihm, paragraph 23].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple interfaces for communication with the BMC in order to allow communication with multiple BMC's within different environments.

5. Claims 22-23, 38, 40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson, and further in view of Srinivasan et al., (US Publication No. 2004/0148385), (hereinafter Srinivasan).

Regarding claim 22, Larson discloses

a channel center which receives/sends an IPMI message from message sources [Larson, paragraph 43];

a plurality of message service modules which designates each IPMI message a default execution procedure, correspondingly [Larson, paragraphs 59-60];

a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units [Larson, figure 5, items 548 A-H] which concurrently multi-process the IPMI messages to enable the advanced IPMI system for configurable execution performance [Larson, paragraphs 59-60], by way of each message processing unit looking up the corresponding message service module of the message sheet according to each IPMI message and initiating the execution procedure of the message service module for executing the IPMI message [Larson, paragraphs 59-60].

Larson does not specifically disclose,

a programmable-configured message sheet which allows the user to define the corresponding relation between each IPMI message and said message service module.

However, Srinivasan in the same field of endeavor discloses the end user is then provided with a GUI on the computer display which allows the end user to select hardware events and software services to be monitored and the type of corrective actions (if any) that are to be taken [Srinivasan, paragraph 25].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a user configurable list of items in order to provide the user with the ability to update the configurable parameters of the monitored resources and provide for the actions to be accomplished based on the different alert levels set.

Regarding claim 23, Larson-Srinivasan further discloses wherein the message processing unit is a thread [Larson, paragraph 44] and the execution procedure of the message service module is a routine [Larson, paragraph 60].

Regarding claim 38, Larson-Srinivasan further discloses a channel center receiving at least one IPMI message from message sources [Larson, paragraph 43];

by a plurality of programmable-configured message processing units, multi-processing concurrently the IPMI messages, each initiating according to each IPMI message a message service module having a default execution procedure [Srinivasan, paragraph 25];

by at least one application unit, executing the IPMI message according to the execution procedure of the message service module thereby generating a response message [Srinivasan, paragraphs 25 and 27]; and

sending back the response message to message sources through the channel center [Larson, paragraph 43].

Regarding claim 40, Larson-Srinivasan further discloses looking up the corresponding message service module of a programmable-configured message sheet according to the IPMI message and initiating the execution procedure of the message service module for executing the IPMI message, the message sheet defining the corresponding relation between every IPMI message and the message service module [Srinivasan, paragraphs 25 and 27].

Regarding claim 44, Larson-Srinivasan further discloses wherein the message processing unit is a thread [Larson, paragraph 44] and the execution procedure of the message service module is a routine [Larson, paragraph 60].

6. Claims 7-10, 24-26, 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Srinivasan, and further in view of Brunner.

Regarding claim 7, Larson further discloses an IPMI message subsystem [Larson, paragraph 43] having a channel center used to receive/send an IPMI message from message sources [Larson, paragraph 42], and having a message execution group [Larson, paragraphs 59-60] which initiates a corresponding execution procedure with respect to each IPMI message [Larson, paragraphs 59-60];

an IPMI core subsystem having a plurality of application units [Larson, paragraph 42] at least one which executes the IPMI message according to the execution procedure of the IPMI message subsystem [Larson, paragraph 60]; and
a central message buffer unit [Larson, paragraph 59-60];
wherein the message execution group [Larson, paragraph 59] further comprises:
a plurality of message service modules which designates every IPMI message a default execution procedure correspondingly wherein at least one execution procedure instructs the application units of the IPMI core subsystem for executing said IPMI message [Larson, paragraphs 59-60];
at least one of multiple message processing units which looks up a corresponding message service module of the message sheet according to every IPMI message and initiates the execution procedure of the message service module [Larson, paragraphs 59-60].

Larson does not specifically disclose,
a programmable-configured message sheet which allows the user to define the corresponding relation between each IPMI message and said message service module.

However, Srinivasan in the same field of endeavor discloses the end user is then provided with a GUI on the computer display which allows the end user to select hardware events and software services to be monitored and the type of corrective actions (if any) that are to be taken [Srinivasan, paragraph 25].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a user configurable list of items in order to provide the user with the ability to update the configurable parameters of the monitored resources and provide for the actions to be accomplished based on the different alert levels set.

Larson-Srinivasan does not specifically disclose a central message buffer unit having a memory block which provides a pointer of a corresponding address in the block for temporary storage of each IPMI message wherein each said subsystem just transmits the pointer therebetween thereby reducing times of reading the IPMI message and raising the performance of the IPMI system.

However, Brunner discloses the user interface may transmit a pointer associated with the selected target from the user input to the target processor, which in turn, retrieves the target data associated with transmitted pointer from the memory [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 8, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses wherein the message execution group further programmably configures the multiple message processing units that concurrently multi-process the IPMI messages to enable the advanced IPMI system configurable execution performance [Srinivasan, paragraph 25].

Regarding claim 9, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses wherein the message processing units of the message execution group receive the pointers of the IPMI message and transmit the pointers to the application units of said IPMI core subsystem through the message service modules [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 10, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses wherein the application units of said IPMI core subsystem read and process the IPMI message from the central message buffer unit according to the pointer [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 24, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses a plurality of application units, at least one application unit executing the IPMI message according to the execution procedure [Larson, paragraph 60]; and
a central message buffer unit having a memory block which provides a pointer of a corresponding address for temporary storage of each IPMI message wherein the pointer transmitted by said application units, is used for reducing said application units times of reading the IPMI message and raising the performance of the IPMI system [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 25, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses wherein the message processing units receive the pointers of the IPMI message [Brunner, paragraph 34] and then transmit the pointers to the application units through the message service modules [Larson, paragraph 43].

Regarding claim 26, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses wherein the application units read and process the IPMI message from the central message buffer unit according to the pointer [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 39, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses by the channel center temporarily, storing each said IPMI message in a central message buffer unit [Srinivasan, paragraphs 25 and 27] and therefore getting a pointer to a corresponding address and transmitting said pointer to the message processing unit [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 41, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses the message processing units transmitting the pointers to the IPMI message through the message service modules to the application units for processing [Brunner, paragraph 34].

Regarding claim 42, Larson-Srinivasan-Brunner further discloses the application units sending, reading, and processing the IPMI message from the central message buffer unit [Larson, paragraph 43] according to the pointer [Brunner, paragraph 34].

7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson, and further in view of Mihm.

Regarding claim 27, Larson discloses a real time operating system (RTOS) management module having multiple specific mapping functions for communicating with different types of RTOS, allowing the advanced IPMI system to function with different RTOS [Larson, paragraph 72].

Larson does not specifically disclose a hardware management module having a plurality of driver units for communicating with different baseboard management controllers (BMC), allowing the advanced IPMI system to function in different hardware environments.

However, Mihm discloses the IPMI specification defines multiple interfaces for communication with the BMC and for getting information that the BMC provides and for communication with multiple BMC's [Mihm, paragraph 23].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple interfaces for communication with the BMC in order to allow communication with multiple BMC's within different environments.

8. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson-Srinivasan as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Sanghvi et al., (US Publication No. 2002/0010804), (hereinafter Sanghvi).

Regarding claim 43, Larson-Srinivasan wherein the application units comprise at least an event daemon [Larson, figure 5], a sensor manager [Larson, figure 5, 548 A-H], a chassis controller [Larson figure 5], an I2C driver management unit [Larson, figure 5], a memory control unit [Larson, figure 5], a chip management unit [Larson, figure 5], an advanced configuration and power interface (ACPI) [Larson, figure 5, paragraph 17], a basic general purpose input/output (GPIO) [Larson, figure 5], and a power manager [Larson, figure 5].

Larson-Srinivasan does not specifically disclose a platform event filter management unit (PEF), a simple network management protocol (SNMP) trap.

However, Sanghvi discloses an event filter [Sanghvi, paragraph 8] and using an SNMP trap [Sanghvi, page 3, TABLE 1].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include SNMP and event filtering in order to allow for additional message protocols and provide for filtering those messages to find a response.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-10, 16-17, 22-27 and 38-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD whose telephone number is (571)270-1589. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday / 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

WJG
03/30/2009